



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/655,273	09/05/2000	C. Douglass Thomas	CDTP006	8031
7590 C Douglass Thomas 1193 Capri Drive Campbell, CA 95008				
EXAMINER				
AL HASHEMI, SANA A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2169				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/16/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/655,273

Applicant(s)

THOMAS, C. DOUGLASS

Examiner

Sana Al-Hashemi

Art Unit

2169

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-12, 16, 19, 20 and 22-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-12, 16, 19, 20 and 22-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is issued in response to amendment/RCE filed 10/30/08.

Claims 6-12, 16, 19-20, 22-38 are pending. Claims 1-5, 13-14, 17-18, 21, were canceled.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/30/08 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-11, 16, 19-20, 22-24, 27-31 and 34-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freivald et al. (U.S. Patent 5,898,836) in view of Glogau (U.S. Patent 5,983,351).

Preliminary Note: Since claim 19 is the first independent claim of record, it is discussed first, followed by the discussion for the remaining claims of record.

Claim 19: Col. 6, lines 32-54 of Freivald et al. outline the steps of registering a web page document and comparing a currently available version of the web page document to an older archived version of the document. The comparison is accomplished by comparing a checksum of CRC values for each document. This checksum of CRC values are the claimed "page defining information" which are compared to produce a change indication. In response a to a sufficient degree of change, a determination is made for the need of an update action, such as a need for a correction of links (col. 13, line 65 through col. 14, line 10). Freivald disclosed the Copyright registration in Col. 2, lines 49-53, the inventor's website. The Freivald does not clearly disclose the copyright registration or the steps of producing a copyright registration application. On the other hand, Glogau et al. teaches the general principle that a website may be copyrighted. In addition, Glogau teaches the concept of reviewing website content and then subsequently generating the form to initiate a U.S. copy right registration, which correlates to the claimed "registration application information". It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Freivald et al. to incorporate copyright registered documents in order to facilitate the protection of the intellectual property in those documents. It would further have been obvious to modify Freivald et al. to add copyright registration functionality to the web management system of Freivald et al. in order to provide intellectual property protection to the reviewed web

documents, as taught by Glogau. Furthermore the combination of Glogau in view of Freivald discloses a storing the copyright registration application information Col. 8, lines 64-67, Freivald. Wherein the copy right registration pertain to attributes of the at least a portion of the website, the attributes including at least two or more of: date, size, word count, links, frames layout, tables, colors, number of inputs, and number or types of buttons Col. 8, lines 1-65, Freivald.

Claims: 6-11, 20, 22-24 and 27-31: The reasons for these rejections were set forth in the office action of July 13, 2005 and are hereby incorporated by reference.

Claim 11: Freivald in the combination of Glogau in view of Freivald teaches a registering of the website with the U.S. Copyright based at least in part on the copyright registration application information when it is determined that the copyright registration update is needed for the website (Col. 7, lines 58-65)

Claim 16: Glogau in view of Freivald teaches that a copyright registration is performed and that the registration may be on-line and interactive (col. 7, lines 9-14 of Glogau). The exact content of the registration, such as the claimed "references to previous registration" are non-functional descriptive material because they are merely referring to the text content within the registration. Non-functional descriptive material does not carry patentable weight. See In re Ngai, 367 F.3d 1336, 70 USPQ2d 1862 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

Claim 34: Within Freivald, in the combination of Freivald in view of Glogau the checksums of CRC values are compared in order to determine if sufficient change has occurred. The "threshold level" is the checksummed CRC value of either the older archived document or the recent document. Since a web user creates and/or modifies the documents that establishes

these CRC values, these threshold levels are "user-alterable" as Claim 35: The checksum of CRCs are the claimed "page defining information" for each document. This CRC value derives from the content of the document. The content of the document is an attribute of the document.

Claim 36: As seen in FIG. 7 of Freivald et al., each document can have a set of individual CRC values, one for each tagged section of the document. The individual CRC values can be read as individual weights, and each tagged section can be read as an attribute. Since the individual CRCs can be different, each attribute can be associated with a different weight.

Claims 37-38: See remarks for claim 19.

Claims 12, 25, 26, 32 and 33 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freivald (U.S. Patent 5,898,836) in view of Glogau (U.S. Patent 5,983,351) and further in view of Information Today.

The reasons for this rejection were set forth in the office action of July 13, 2005 and are hereby incorporated by reference.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/30/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues the combination of Freivald in view of Glogau fails to disclose the newly amended limitations.

Examiner disagrees. All newly amended limitations have been addressed in the rejection above.

Point of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sana Al-Hashemi whose telephone number is 571-272-4013. The examiner can normally be reached on 8Am-4:30Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Pierre Vital can be reached on 571-272-4125. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sana Al-Hashemi/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2169
January 13, 2009